UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,296	09/15/2003	Aman Naimat	ORCL5982	2613

53156 7590 09/30/2008

YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C.
4370 ALPINE RD.
STE. 106
PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028

EXAMINER	
REYES, MARIELA D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,296	NAIMAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mariela D. Reyes	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 June 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action has been issued in response to the amendment filed on June 17th, 2008. Claims 1-16 are pending. Applicant's arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (US PG Pub 2002/0052882) in view of Andrews et al (US PG Pub 2002/0077998).

With respect to independent claim 1:

Taylor teaches:

A method of evaluating data stored in a data source, the method comprising:

Allowing a user to define a plurality of rules that operate on data formatted according to the data format, (Paragraph [0040], discloses that the user will define rules that will be used to organize and manipulate data depending on specific attributes)

wherein the rules are intended to assess a quality of data; (Paragraph [0046] Lines 23-24, discloses that the data sets derived from the rules defined by the user will be used to derive statistical measures of data quality)

Mapping data from the data source to the data format; and (Paragraph [0040], discloses that the data will be mapped to a specific attribute to be used in the execution of the user defined rules)

Executing the plurality of rules on the mapped data to produce a set of analyzed data that allows evaluation according to an assessed quality of the data. (Paragraph [0046] Lines 23-33, discloses that the data sets derived by the user defined rules will be used to analyze data quality of the data)

Taylor does not appear to explicitly disclose **allowing a user to define a data format; the data being contacts.**

Andrews teaches **allowing a user to define a data format;** (Paragraphs [0079-0081], disclose that the sales leads will include data that will be divided into different formats depending on the organization it is directed to and that the user can define said data formats) **the data being contacts.** (Paragraph [06], discloses a database that stores a plurality of information of sales leads (contacts))

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **allowing a user to define a data format; the data being contacts** so that the data can be manipulated and analyzed for commerce purposes. (As presented in Andrews)

With respect to claim 2:

Taylor teaches:

The data source is either a database or a spreadsheet file. (Paragraph [0017], discloses that the data will be stored in a database that can be a relational database or a flat file)

With respect to claim 4:

Andrews teaches:

The data source comprises a plurality of sales leads. (Paragraph [06], discloses a database that stores a plurality of sales leads)

With respect to claim 5:

Taylor teaches:

The plurality of rules that can be defined by a user include spatial rules, age/lineage rules, pattern-based rules, electronic validation rules and numeric operator-based rules. (Paragraph [0040], discloses that the user defined rules will break the data into groups based on common attributes, this is clearly a pattern based rules)

With respect to independent claim 9:

Taylor teaches:

A method of evaluating data stored in a data source, the method comprising:

Allowing a user to define a plurality of rules that operate on data formatted according to the data format, (Paragraph [0040], discloses that the user will define rules that will be used to organize and manipulate data depending on specific attributes) **wherein the rules are intended to assess a quality of data** (Paragraph [0046] Lines 23-24, discloses that the data sets derived from the rules defined by the user will be used to derive statistical measures of data quality) **and include spatial rules, pattern-based rules and electronic validation rules;** (Paragraph [0040], discloses that the user defined rules will break the data into groups based on common attributes, this is clearly a pattern based rules) **the data source is either a database or spreadsheet file**; (Paragraph [0017], discloses that the data will be stored in a database that can be a relational database or a flat file)

Mapping data identifying a plurality of data from the data source to the data format; and (Paragraph [0040], discloses that the data will be mapped to a specific attribute to be used in the execution of the user defined rules)

Executing the plurality of rules on the data to score the data and produce a set of analyzed data usable to assess the quality of data in the data source.

(Paragraph [0046] Lines 23-33, discloses that the data sets derived by the user defined rules will be used to analyze data quality of the data)

Taylor does not appear to explicitly disclose **allowing a user to define a data format; the data being contacts.**

Andrews teaches **allowing a user to define a data format;** (Paragraphs [0079-0081], disclose that the sales leads will include data that will be divided into different formats depending on the organization it is directed to and that the user can define said data formats) **the data being contacts.** (Paragraph [06], discloses a database that stores a plurality of information of sales leads (contacts))

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **allowing a user to define a data format; the data being contacts** so that the data can be manipulated and analyzed for commerce purposes. (As presented in Andrews)

)

With respect to claim 12, Taylor teaches:

The plurality of rules that can be defined by a user further comprise age/lineage rules and numeric operator-based rules. (Paragraph [0040], discloses that one of the user defined rules may be comparing certain attributes for each data element, this combination could be performed in numbers therefore is numeric)

With respect to independent claim 13:

Taylor teaches:

A system for evaluating data stored in data source, the system comprising:

A user interface component configured to allow one or more users to define a plurality of rules that operate on, and are intended to assess a quality of, (Paragraph [0046] Lines 23-24, discloses that the data sets derived from the rules defined by the user will be used to derive statistical measures of data quality) **data formatted according to the data format;** (Paragraph [0040], discloses that the user will define rules that will be used to organize and manipulate data depending on specific attributes)

Map data identifying a plurality of data from the data source to the data format; and (Paragraph [0040], discloses that the data will be mapped to a specific attribute to be used in the execution of the user defined rules)

A rules engine component configured to execute the plurality of rules on the mapped data to produce a set of analyzed data that allows evaluation of potential data according to an assessed quality of the data, (Paragraph [0046] Lines 23-33, discloses that the data sets derived by the user defined rules will be used to analyze data quality of the data) **the rules engine further configured to provide at least a portion of the analyzed data set to the one users.** (Paragraph [0046] Lines 23-33, discloses that the analyzed data will be presented to the user)

Taylor does not appear to explicitly disclose **allowing a user to define a data format; the data being contacts.**

Andrews teaches **allowing a user to define a data format;** (Paragraphs [0079-0081], disclose that the sales leads will include data that will be divided into different formats depending on the organization it is directed to and that the user can define said data formats) **the data being contacts.** (Paragraph [06], discloses a database that stores a plurality of information of sales leads (contacts))

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **allowing a user to define a data format; the data being contacts** so that the data can be manipulated and analyzed for commerce purposes. (As presented in Andrews)

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (US PG Pub 2002/0052882) in view of Andrews et al (US PG Pub 200/0077998) and Mary Jo Nott (New Product News, Published May 21st, 2002)

With respect to claim 3:

The combination of Taylor and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose that **the data source is a heterogeneous data source.**

Nott teaches that **the data source is a heterogeneous data source.** (Paragraph [001], discloses that Cognos allows corporate decisions to be based on data from SAP and non SAP data sources, therefore the collected that comes from

heterogeneous data sources, this helps in the collection of data from different databases in an enterprise and allows flawless communication between the heterogeneous database and the 360 degree view of business operations)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement that **the data source is a heterogeneous data source** because this helps in the collection of data from different databases in an enterprise and allows flawless communication between the heterogeneous database and the 360 degree view of business operations.

Claims 6, 7, 10, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (US PG Pub 2002/0052882) in view of Andrews et al (US PG Pub 200/0077998) and Fagin et al (US Patent 6,014,664).

With respect to claim 6:

The combination of Taylor and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose **the step of executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.**

Fagin teaches **the step of executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.** (Column 1 Lines 8-11, discloses that rules that will have scores assigned to them so that data can be assigned scores)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **the step of executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data** because this

would help in the fact that then the user could have an idea of which results are more important.

With respect to claim 7:

The combination of Taylor and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score.**

Fagin teaches that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score.** (Column 8 Lines 54-47, discloses that the user will create the scoring for each rule therefore the user is the one responsible for the ranking of the data)

With respect to claim 10:

The combination of Taylor and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose that **executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.**

Fagin teaches that **executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.** (Column 1 Lines 8-11, discloses that rules that will have scores assigned to them so that data can be assigned scores)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data** because this would help in the fact that then the user could have an idea of which results are more important.

With respect to claim 14:

The combination of Taylor and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose that **the user interface component allows users to associate a score with each defined rule and wherein the rules engine component scores the mapped data during execution of the plurality of rules.**

Fagin teaches that **the user interface component allows users to associate a score with each defined rule and wherein the rules engine component scores the mapped data during execution of the plurality of rules.** (Column 1 Lines 8-11, discloses that rules that will have scores assigned to them so that data can be assigned scores)

With respect to claim 15:

The combination of Taylor and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose that **the user interface is further configured to allow a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules.**

Fagin teaches that **the user interface is further configured to allow a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules.** (Column 8 Lines 54-47, discloses that the user will create the scoring for each rule therefore the user is the one responsible for the ranking of the data)

Claims 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (US PG Pub 2002/0052882) in view of Andrews et al (US PG Pub 200/0077998) and Hibbets et al (US Patent 5,787,418).

With respect to claim 8:

The combination of Taylor and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose **that after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to sort the analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.**

Hibbetts teaches **that after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to sort the analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.** (Column 5 Lines 1-13, discloses a user being able to sort data into tables by selecting data based on its attributes, this would allow the user to have control over the final ranking and sorting of the data therefore making it more functional)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **that after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to sort the analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user** because this would allow the user to have control over the final ranking and sorting of the data therefore making it more functional.

With respect to claim 11:

The combination of Taylor and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to sort the analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.**

Hibbetts teaches that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to sort the analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.** (Column 5 Lines 1-13, discloses a user being able to sort data into tables by selecting data based on its attributes, this would allow the user to have control over the final ranking and sorting of the data therefore making it more functional)

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (US PG Pub 2002/0052882) in view of Andrews et al (US PG Pub 200/0077998), Fagin et al (US Patent 6,014,664) and Hibbets et al (US Patent 5,787,418).

With respect to claim 16:

The combination of Taylor and Andrews and Fagin does not appear to explicitly disclose **that the user interface is further configured to, after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules, allow a user to sort data from the set of analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.**

Hibbetts teaches **that the user interface is further configured to, after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules, allow a user to sort data from the set of analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user.** (Column 5 Lines 1-13, discloses a user being able to sort data into tables by selecting data based on its attributes, this would allow the user to have control over the final ranking and sorting of the data therefore making it more functional)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **that the user interface is further configured to, after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules, allow a user to sort data from the set of analyzed data into buckets according to whether or not the data passed specific rules identified by the user** because this would allow the user to have control over the final ranking and sorting of the data therefore making it more functional.

Response to Arguments

The following arguments are in response to the remarks filed on June 17th, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

With respect to claims 1 and 13:

Applicant argues **"Taylor does not disclose defining a plurality of rules that operate on data formatted according to the data format"** Examiner respectfully disagrees. Taylor (Paragraph [040]) discloses defining a plurality of rules to order

(operate) data according to the data attributes (format). Therefore defining rules that will operate on the formatted data.

Applicant also argues **"The applied combination of a primary reference that does not include the words contact or potential contact and of a secondary reference that does not include the word format, cannot render the pending claims obvious".** Examiner would like to point out that even if the cited references do not include the specific words relied in the claims, the concepts are included and there is no need for said specific words to be recited in the references.

Applicant also argues **"Andrews does not disclose allowing a user to define a data format"** Examiner respectfully disagrees. Andrews (Paragraph [093]) discloses a user being able to define a data format (sales tracker) when setting up a user account.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariela D. Reyes whose telephone number is (571) 270-1006. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 7:30- 5:00 East time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mariela D Reyes/
Examiner, Art Unit 2167
September 25, 2008

/DEBBIE M LE/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2168